

From: S.Yesilyurt
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, jmweb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein, Mike Powell, Campaignlaw, FCC FCCINFO, Congressman Mike Honda
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 1:13 AM
Subject: NO TO CORPORATE TAKE-OVER OF OUR AIR WAYS AND PRINT MEDIA

TO:
Chairman Michael K. Powell: mpowell@fcc.gov
Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy: kabernat@fcc.gov
Commissioner Michael J. Copps: mcopps@fcc.gov
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin: kjmweb@fcc.gov
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein: jadelste@fcc.gov
FCC COMPLAINTS fccinfo@fcc.gov

Senator Diana Feinstein senator@feinstein.senate.gov
Senator Barbara Boxer senator@boxer.senate.gov
Congressman Mike Honda mike.honda@mail.house.gov

RE: CURRENT DRIVE TO DE-REGULATE THE FCC LICENSES

Dear Chairman, Commissioners, Honorable Senators and Congressman,

I have been reading about FCC's recent drive to change the media ownership rules. While changes in technology and marketplace may require implementation of certain changes in the current rules, I am writing to you to express my concern regarding the effects of the proposed changes. We should not implement rules that will allow any centralization of the media power (electronic, print, etc) into the hands of a few corporations.

It appears that the proposed changes (at least some of them) will allow current media corporations to consolidate their power in local markets even at greater scale. Newspaper/broadcast and radio/TV station cross-ownership rules should not be changed to please a few corporations. I am against this whole-sale of public domain to these corporations in the name of "economies of scale."

Elected officials, savvy commissioners, please do not allow this scam to go thru. Thank you.
Sincerely yours.

Suley Yesilyurt.
Cupertino, CA 95014

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.

From: S.Yesilyurt
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, jmweb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein, Mike Powell, Campaignlaw, FCC FCCINFO, Congressman Mike Honda
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 1:13 AM
Subject: NO TO CORPORATE TAKE-OVER OF OUR AIR WAYS AND PRINT MEDIA

TO:
Chairman Michael K. Powell: mpowell@fcc.gov
Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy: kabernat@fcc.gov
Commissioner Michael J. Copps: mcopps@fcc.gov
Commissioner Kevin J. Martin: kjmweb@fcc.gov
Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein: jadelste@fcc.gov
FCC COMPLAINTS fccinfo@fcc.gov

Senator Diana Feinstein senator@feinstein.senate.gov
Senator Barbara Boxer senator@boxer.senate.gov
Congressman Mike Honda mike.honda@mail.house.gov

RE: CURRENT DRIVE TO DE-REGULATE THE FCC LICENSES

Dear Chairman, Commissioners, Honorable Senators and Congressman,

I have been reading about FCC's recent drive to change the media ownership rules. While changes in technology and marketplace may require implementation of certain changes in the current rules, I am writing to you to express my concern regarding the effects of the proposed changes. We should not implement rules that will allow any centralization of the media power (electronic, print, etc) into the hands of a few corporations.

It appears that the proposed changes (at least some of them) will allow current media corporations to consolidate their power in local markets even at greater scale. Newspaper/broadcast and radio/TV station cross-ownership rules should not be changed to please a few corporations. I am against this whole-sale of public domain to these corporations in the name of "economies of scale."

Elected officials, savvy commissioners, please do not allow this scam to go thru. Thank you.
Sincerely yours.

Suley Yesilyurt.
Cupertino, CA 95014

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.

From: Lia vondamm
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 1:31 AM
Subject: I do NOT NOT NOT support media consolidation and the easing of ownship rules!

I am quite concerned with the current trend to ignore anti-trust laws and allow the formation of monopolies, which the FCC would further support through media consolidation.

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited. PLUS, economically the mergers of media cause JOB reduction (in a bad economic times, the last thing we need are less jobs!) and with National advertising small businesses are severely affected because they cannot afford the advertising costs, hense destroying competition.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge, our ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

I think it is important for the FCC to not only consider the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is incumbent on the Commission to take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Thank you,

Lia von Damm
Los Gatos, CA 95033

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.
<http://search.yahoo.com>

From: Tammy Ballard
To: john_mccain@mccain.senate.gov, Mike Powell, KM KJMWEB, Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 2:13 AM
Subject: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation.

Re: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation.

Further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation" must be halted. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide unbiased information about most crucial issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq.

As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to challenge the media conglomerates, to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. Oppose media deregulation.

Thank You,

Tammy Ballard

There were exactly 704 stories in the campaign about this flap of Gore inventing the Internet. There were only 13 stories about Bush failing to show up for his National Guard duty for a year. There were well over 1,000 stories -- Nexus stopped at 1,000 -- about Gore and the Buddhist temple. Only 12 about Bush being accused of insider trading at Harken Energy. There were 347 about Al Gore wearing earth tones, but only 10 about the fact that Dick Cheney did business with Iran and Iraq and Libya.

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster. Easier. Bingo.

From: David E Wunsch
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Mike Powell, Campaignlaw, FCC FCCINFO
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 3:12 AM
Subject: Loosening Ownership rules

Please do not permit more concentration of ownership of radio and TV broadcast stations.
David and Rosemarie Wunsch dewunsch@ieee.org 408-257-0501
6235 Prospect Road
San Jose CA 95129

CC: Mike Honda

From: David E Wunsch
To: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Mike Powell, Campaignlaw, FCC FCCINFO
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 3:12 AM
Subject: Loosening Ownership rules

Please do not permit more concentration of ownership of radio and TV broadcast stations.
David and Rosemarie Wunsch dewunsch@ieee.org 408-257-0501
6235 Prospect Road
San Jose CA 95129

CC: Mike Honda

From: RSC
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 3:13 AM
Subject: Re: FCC deregulation

You have seen what energy deregulation did to the rigged California energy crisis and corporate malfeasance that led to a near collapse of the financial market.

Communications deregulation will further lead to oligopoly of media, and soon a few white men will control information and how we think. Power corrupt and absolute power corrupt absolutely. Greed, aggression, control are more dominant traits than altruism and fairness. Checks and balances are important elements of democracy.

In light of 911, more than ever, we need a free press, not a State-controlled media.

Betty L. King
Dr. Ruben S. Cuyugan
Iolita Santos
Bart Dols
Dylan Nakrin
Oscar Sherill
Jackie Beck
Noelle derrickson
Bill bell

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (<http://www.grisoft.com>).
Version: 6.0.474 / Virus Database: 272 - Release Date: 4/18/03

From: Peggy Tileston
To: Mike Powell
Date: Mon, Apr 28, 2003 5:36 AM
Subject: deregulation

Dear Commissioner,

Further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation" must be halted. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide unbiased information about most crucial issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq.

As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to challenge the media conglomerates, to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. Oppose media deregulation.

Sincerely,

Peggy Tileston

Edgartown, MA

CC: KM KJMWEB, Kathleen Abernathy

From: Joan Howard
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/5/03 10:03AM
Subject: I oppose the 'must carry' law

I support continued C-SPAN coverage of Federal and National events, e.g., Senate hearings, The House proceedings and other vital LIVE news worthy events which may not otherwise get coverage. Please keep it available on cable TV.

Thank you.
Joan Howard
Scottsdale, AZ

From: Casey DeHoney
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB
Date: 3/9/03 3:31PM
Subject: Dual/digital must carry

Dear FCC Chairman and Commissioners,

I support C-SPAN's stance against the dual/digital must carry rule. Please give the free market a chance to work and don't enable the public good/service of C-SPAN and other like stations to be knocked off the airwaves.

Sincerely,
Casey DeHoney
R. 1 Box 646
Cloverdale, IN 46120
765-795-6096
dehoney@ccrtc.com

From: vze2cdxz@verizon.net
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/9/03 3:32PM
Subject: Dual Must Carry

Michael K. Powell, Chairman
Federal Communications Commission

Dear Sir,

Historically, every dictatorship begins its reign of terror by first seizing control of the free press. It is for this reason that I am convinced that the imposition of a "dual must carry" rule has as its primary purpose the suppression of free speech. While I am not endowed with the power or the wisdom to decide what should or should not be considered legitimate news, I am possessed with the common sense to realize that the commercial media, owned and operated by commercial interests, who serve the campaign finance interest of elected officials can not be relied upon to disseminate unbiased news.

From: Mart Green
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/21/03 12:43PM
Subject: dual must carry comment

Dear Chairman Powell,

It is my understanding that the FCC has not yet issued a final rule regarding dual must carry issues.

I would like to most emphatically urge you not to adopt a rule that would in any way discourage local cable stations from feeling able to carry C-SPAN and C-SPAN2, and C-SPAN3 if they should ever decide to distribute it nationally. C-SPAN is the very definition of the idea of using the public airwaves in the public interest and I absolutely can't imagine a federal agency doing anything to interfere with the availability of this crown jewel of American broadcasting.

I am a mild and middle aged wife and mother and I've never written a letter to any agency about any proposed rule about anything, but I feel so strongly about this I will take to the streets to protest any rule that dampens the distribution and growth of C-SPAN.

I don't know if I need to send this comment from a member of the public to a special address within your agency in order to have it count but, if so, I'd appreciate it if you would forward this to that address or have someone contact me with the proper place to comment.

Thank you for your time,

Martha Green
1527 Mt. Vernon
East Lansing, MI
48823

greenstuff@att.net

From: Lenny Padron
To: viewer@c-span.org
Date: 3/22/03 6:52PM
Subject: My vote of Non Support for CSPAN

Recently I have been incredibly disgusted with CSPAN's handling of the US War against Iraq.

The proportion of coverage given to the Anti War demonstrations, versus the Pro War rallies have been very unbalanced, even thou 70% of our country supports the war.

From a person who used to watch CSPAN for hours as far back as 4 years ago I now find myself experiencing the coverage of Pro Abortion Groups, Anti War Rallies sponsored by anti American Communist Organizations, Women for the support of the Iraqi dictatorship, Rallies or coverage of any leftwing university campus or fringe groups, etc etc.

Althou CSPAN has the right to televise whatever they wish, if a fair balance of coverage was presented then I would not have any issue. This in my opinion has not been the case. I thus urge the FCC to remove whatever must carry privilliges that CSPAN enjoys.

CSPAN has lost its bearing and impartiality and thus does not deserve any special consideration from the governement. CSPAN should be treated like anyother cable channel and there should not be any obligation for cable systems to carry it.

I urge the FCC to have a governmental channel that brings to us the two houses of government plus the executive without any biased viewpoint and programing. That is what CSPAN used to do very well but unfortunately not any more.

CSPAN has become a sponsor of one single ideological viewpoint and thus has lost my overall support and trust.

Sincerely
Adalberto Padron
Miami,Florida.

CC: Mike Powell

From: Dick Melita
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/27/03 2:11AM
Subject: Threat to Cable Delivery of C-SPAN

Dear Mr. Powell:

It is with great concern that we have learned of the continuing debate of the Dual Must Carry ruling.

We consider any action by the FCC that would threaten our family's access to the C-SPAN networks a disaster for cable television. Please take this into consideration in your deliberations.

Sincerely,

Richard Melita

CC: <mailto:kabernat@fcc.gov>, <mailto:mcopps@fcc.gov>, <mailto:kjmweb@fcc.gov>

From: Dick Melita
To: Mike Powell
Date: 3/27/03 3:08AM
Subject: Threat to Cable Delivery of C-SPAN

Dear Mr. Powell:

It is with great concern that we have learned of the continuing debate of the Dual Must Carry ruling.

We consider any action by the FCC that would threaten our family's access to the C-SPAN networks a disaster for cable television. Please take this into consideration in your deliberations.

Sincerely,

Richard Melita

kjmweb@fcc.gov
mcopps@fcc.gov
kabernat@fcc.gov

CC: KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy

From: Colin Hoops
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/3/03 4:40PM
Subject: c-span

c-span can be considered an essential check and balance for our system.

It is the only source for the public to observe the processes of government firsthand without the inevitable biases of middlemen. We cannot be afraid to use the communication systems in place to enable democracy, the blood of which is information. There must be some pure sources of that information, and as they are dwindling in numbers, each of the remaining become more important in facilitating informed decisions by the public. This is not a case of government intervening with the market, nor is it an issue of interfering with a network's freedom of speech. Rather, it reflects a government trying to assure that it truly represents and makes manifest the will of its people.

From: Dorrance1@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/4/03 12:45AM
Subject: Truth

Not surprised that this admin. would want C-Span off the airways.

From: David
To: Mike Powell
Date: 4/6/03 12:18PM
Subject: C-Span Presence

C-Span, theoretically represents a free society at its best. And although it falls far short in its representation, its presence is still of value, at least one channel of it!

My concern is that in the challenge to bring "peace" in the American, United State's culture, C-Span needs a little more breadth than the culture of a left-wing or a right-wing media. A current example exemplifies my point. The presence of two telephone numbers to (1) call if you are in favor of the war in Iraq, or (2) if you are opposed, demonstrates not only an uncreative, but disfunctional approach to positive solutions for our society. The war is a fact.

Typical of Washington D.C. carping over perceptions of power, when it comes to national policies, let's have a little more creative help rather than making fools of ourselves with impotent leadership with government supported media!

Dr. F. David Wells
Boise State University

From: EWilson375@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: 4/8/03 9:03AM
Subject: C-Span

Please do not adopt any rules that will take C-Span off the air. It is near the top of the list of my favorite channels.

Elizabeth D. Wilson
Philadelphia, PA
215-248-4860

From: Wendy Miller
To: Michael Copps
Date: 4/12/03 6:49PM
Subject: C-SpAN

I am very concerned about any legislation that could cause me to lose C-Span as part of my cable network. This is the ONLY unbiased news service in my area with coverage of news from all over the world. The loss of this independent news source would be a huge blow to millions of viewers and to the diversity of news sources.

Wendy Miller
San Rafael, CA

From: MortensenM@hotmail.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: 4/16/03 9:16AM
Subject: For CSPAN! Against a 'must carry' rule!

I am a U.S. citizen and viewer of both Adelphia Cable and DISH Satellite TV.
I am against a 'must carry' rule if it means losing any existing CSPAN programming or any existing Public TV channels. I also am wanting to begin receiving CSPAN3 in my area. I currently do not have access to CSPAN3 but am very interested in receiving it.

I am also interested in Technology advancement and excited about Digital TV and HDTV that is on the way. I still do not wish, however, to lose any public programming from networks like CSPAN or should I say from Programs like CSPAN as it gives me true Democracy. True access to listen with my own ears to Congress and other important news - WITHOUT THE FILTERS of Journalistic opinions and Political leanings.

I appreciate greatly receiving this fabulous and very important programming to help educate myself on current events.

PLEASE PLEASE do not take actions that would jeopardize this critical programming.

Thank you for adding my concerns to millions of other viewers. I'm sure I represent a large group with similar views.

Marti Mortensen, Hayden Idaho (near Spokane Washington - 6 hrs from Seattle)
208-772-4856
MortensenM@hotmail.com

P.S. I am a small business person too - who pays for Adelphia Cable TV at home and business locations, as well as DISH SATELLITE TV at several locations in various Counties in North Idaho where I live and work.

From: Marlene Jakubosky
To: Michael Copps
Date: 4/18/03 2:04PM
Subject: c-span

Dear Commissioner Kopps:

I think having C-Span on cable and satellite is crucial to full participation in the American Democratic Process. If the system were changed so that it wasn't on the air, we would all lose out. I don't understand the complexities of the rulings, but as a satellite viewer, I'm forced to pay for scores of stupid shopping stations, and other garbage I don't want, so I don't think it's a big deal for the cable and satellite stations to provide something people actually do want, even if they don't make money off it, because they're sure as hell making money since they have virtual monopolies on the market. I, for one, have the big choice of one satellite provider and don't get local channels. Those who have the priveledge of having a FCC license must realize priveledge comes with responsibilities, and that should be public service. There is no public service more vital than C-Span .

Respectfully,
MRChinello@msn.com

MSN 8 helps ELIMINATE E-MAIL VIRUSES. Get 2 months FREE*.

From: tom barger
To: Mikes. Johanna, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: 3/19/03 2:57PM
Subject: [Fwd: pho: CT: Clear Channel's latest]

From: owner-pho@onehouse.com
To: Pho (E-mail)
cc:
Subject: pho: CT: Clear Channel's latest

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/showcase/chi-0303190157mar19.story>

Media giant's rally sponsorship raises questions

By Tim Jones
Tribune national correspondent

March 19, 2003

Some of the biggest rallies this month have endorsed President Bush's strategy against Saddam Hussein, and the common thread linking most of them is Clear Channel Worldwide Inc., the nation's largest owner of radio stations.

In a move that has raised eyebrows in some legal and journalistic circles, Clear Channel radio stations in Atlanta, Cleveland, San Antonio, Cincinnati and other cities have sponsored rallies attended by up to 20,000 people. The events have served as a loud rebuttal to the more numerous but generally smaller anti-war rallies.

The sponsorship of large rallies by Clear Channel stations is unique among major media companies, which have confined their activities in the war debate to reporting and occasionally commenting on the news. The San Antonio-based broadcaster owns more than 1,200 stations in 50 states and the District of Columbia.

While labor unions and special interest groups have organized and hosted rallies for decades, the involvement of a big publicly regulated broadcasting company breaks new ground in public demonstrations.

"I think this is pretty extraordinary," said former Federal Communications Commissioner Glen Robinson, who teaches law at the University of Virginia. "I can't say that this violates any of a broadcaster's obligations, but it sounds like borderline manufacturing of the news."

A spokeswoman for Clear Channel said the rallies, called "Rally for America," are the idea of Glenn Beck, a Philadelphia talk show host whose program is syndicated by Premier Radio Networks, a Clear Channel subsidiary.

'Just patriotic rallies'

A weekend rally in Atlanta drew an estimated 20,000 people, with some carrying signs reading "God Bless the USA" and other signs condemning France and the group Dixie Chicks, one of whose members recently criticized President Bush.

"They're not intended to be pro-military. It's more of a thank you to the troops. They're just patriotic rallies," said Clear Channel spokeswoman Lisa Dollinger.

Rallies sponsored by Clear Channel radio stations are scheduled for this weekend in Sacramento, Charleston, S.C., and Richmond, Va. Although Clear Channel promoted two of the recent rallies on its corporate Web site, Dollinger said there is no corporate directive that stations organize rallies.